

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

January 18, 2013

The Honorable Martin O'Malley Office of the Governor Maryland State House 100 State Circle Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Governor O'Malley:

I am writing in response to Maryland's request to amend its approved Race to the Top grant project. Between October 25, 2012, and January 7, 2013, the State submitted documentation to and held conversations with the U.S. Department of Education (Department) to support amendment requests to its approved Race to the Top plan. As you are aware, the Department has the authority to approve amendments to your plan and budget, provided that such a change does not alter the scope or objectives of the approved proposal. On October 4, 2011, the Department sent a letter and revised "Grant Amendment Submission Process" document to Governors of grantee States indicating the process by which amendments would be reviewed and approved or denied. To determine whether approval could be granted, the Department has applied the conditions noted in the document, and compared it with the Race to the Top program *Principles*, which are also included in that document.

I approve the amendments outlined in the attached table. The amendments are driven by three factors.

- First, Maryland has chosen to align their Race to the Top grant year (October 1 September 30) with its State fiscal year (July 1 June 30). This change requires funds intended for expenditure between June 30 and September 30, 2012 to be shifted from Year 2 to Year 3 of the grant.
- Second, in some instances, the funds shifted from Year 2 to Year 3 were greater than anticipated based on the grant year adjustment due to implementation delays or changes in approach. For these projects, the State provided additional explanation and documentation to justify the shift in funds, as outlined in the attached table.

www.ed.gov

• Finally, the State adjusted its indirect cost allocation to account for an increased approved rate for Year 2 and actual direct cost project expenditures. This adjustment resulted in minor shifts in funds in the projects outlined in the attached table.

It is our understanding that these amendments will not result in a change in your State's performance measures and outcomes, nor will they substantially change the Scope of Work. Please note that this letter will be posted on the Department's website as a record of the amendments.

If you need any assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top, please do not hesitate to contact Maryland's Race to the Top Program Officer, Melissa Siry, at 202-260-0926 or Melissa.Siry@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s//

Ann Whalen Director, Policy and Program Implementation Implementation and Support Unit

Cc: Dr. Lillian Lowery, State Superintendent of Schools James V. Foran

This table details the grant project area, specific project and description of each approved amendment.

| Grant project area affected | Specific project | Description of change |
|--|--|---|
| B. Standards and Assessments | 4/3: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development | 1) Shift \$1,567,966 from Year 2 (across budget categories) to Years 3 and 4 due to the change in budget years and delays in the online STEM courses project. Based on conversations with the State, it is the Department's understanding that STEM course procurements were delayed due to the complexity of the solicitation, along with the cross-project collaboration needed to develop, review, and finalize requirements. The State will shift contractual funds into Year 3 as a result of the course development delays These four courses will now be available in fall 2013, a year later than planned. 2) The State has updated contractual costs for the STEM online courses based on more accurate cost estimates, and will shift project funds to support the work of four educators to align Maryland with the New Generation |
| C. Data Systems to Support Instruction | 8/11: Develop the Overall Technology Infrastructure to Support Race to the Top Initiatives | of National Standards for the Arts Initiative. Shift \$2,486,934 from Year 2 to Years 3 and 4 contractual, equipment and indirect costs as a result of the project year change, project delays, and project funds that have been obligated but not yet spent. As a result of delays, both the K12 and P-20 (LDS) production systems will now be fully rolled out in January and February of 2013, instead of September 2012. The State will also shift Year 2, 3, and 4 personnel, fringe, and travel funds shift to Years 3 and 4 contractual and indirect costs because MSDE has been unable to hire qualified personnel and would like to use to funds to hire contractors to accomplish the work detailed in the approved Scope of Work. |
| C. Data Systems to Support Instruction | 10/28: Multi-Media Training | 1) Shift \$630,924 of contractual funds from Year 2 to Year 3 due to procurement delays. As a result of these delays, the LEA LDS Training Academy is approximately four months behind schedule. The State indicated that it is providing other training opportunities and does not believe the delay will have a significant impact on system usage by teachers and principals. 2) The State made minor adjustments to its indirect costs based on the revised rate and actual direct costs. |

| Grant project area affected | Specific project | Description of change |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| C. Data | 13/61: Develop P-20 | Due to change in budget year, the State will shift \$1,776,191 from Year 2 to Year 3. Of this total, |
| Systems to | and Workforce Data | \$783,582 was encumbered in contracts, but not expended during Year 2. Additionally, \$663,750.50 was |
| Support | Warehouse and | budgeted for the final quarter in Year 2, and will therefore move to the first quarter of Year 3 due to the |
| Instruction | Center | change in fiscal year. |
| | | |
| | | |
| C. Data | 14/31: Develop and | Shift \$1,235,552 from Year 2 to Year 3 as a result of the change in budget year and project delays. The |
| Systems to | Implement a State | State's inability to hire qualified staff and delays in the procurement process have resulted in a two- |
| Support | Curriculum | month delay (November 2012 instead of September 2012) for the launch of the Curriculum |
| Instruction | Management System | Management System (CMS) with full rollout now scheduled for Spring 2013. The shift also moves |
| | | equipment funds to contractual because the original equipment budget called for hardware and |
| | | software procurements no longer needed because the State is leveraging previously purchased |
| | | software applications. These funds will support additional contractual resources needed for |
| | | application support, system administration resources as the system transitions into production, and meta-tagging services for CMS content. |
| | | |
| C. Data | 15/7: Expand | Due to change in budget year, the State will shift \$1,519,119 from Year 2 to Year 3. Of this total, |
| Systems to | Instructional Toolkit | \$996,913 was encumbered in contracts, but not expended during Year 2. |
| Support | | |
| Instruction | | |

| Grant project area affected | Specific project | Description of change |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| C. Data | 17/32: Implement a | 1) In Project 17/32, shift \$1,059,997 from Year 2 to Year 3 and in Project 18/33, shift \$2,110,404 from |
| Systems to | Test Item Bank | Year 2 equipment and contractual to the same categories in Year 3 as a result of the new budget year |
| Support | System and 18/33: | and a five month delay in project activities. The State reports that delays were caused by its decision to |
| Instruction | Implement a | combine the RFPs for Projects 17/32 and 18/33. Procurement of the test item bank system and |
| | Computer Adaptive | computer adaptive testing system occured in December 2012 instead of July 2012, as initially planned. |
| | Test Delivery System | Maryland reports that the procurement delay will not result in a delay in the completion and rollout of |
| | | the systems. 2) In Project 17/32, shift \$206,054 in Year 2 equipment to Year 4 contractual (\$150,000) and |
| | | Years 3 (\$37,454) and 4 (\$18,600) indirect costs because the State anticipates needing additional |
| | | contractual funds in Year 4 to support rollout of and training for the test item bank system and indirect |
| | | costs were not originally calculated correctly for this project budget. 3) In Project 18/33, shift \$264,296 |
| | | in Year 2 equipment to Year 4 contractual (\$150,000) and Year 3 (\$95,946) and Year 4 (\$18,600) indirect |
| | | costs because indirect costs were not assessed in the original project budget and the State anticipates |
| | | needing additional contractual funds in Year 4 to support rollout and training. |
| C. Data | 19/34: Complete an | Shift all Year 2 funds (\$780,000) from Year 2 to Year 3 due to the new budget year and delays in project |
| Systems to | Item Load and Set | activities resulting in delays in interdependent projects (17/32 and 18/33); the test item bank and |
| Support | Up for the Test Bank | computer adaptive testing system must be selected prior to purchasing test item content, since item |
| Instruction | and CAT System | content selection is dependent on system selection. Item content will now be procured in January 2013 |
| | | instead of May 2012, as initially planned. |
| C. Data | 22/06: Develop On- | 1) Shift all Year 2 funds (\$500,000 in contractual) from Year 2 to Year 3 as a result of delays in finalizing |
| Systems to | line Instructional | the contract with the vendor and subsequent contract approval delays. 2) The State will also reduce the |
| Support | Intervention | number of online instructional intervention modules to be procured through this project from 750 to |
| Instruction | Modules | approximately 375, based on increased estimates of the cost of each module. As a result of these |
| | | changes, fewer modules will be available to teachers but the State believes 375 modules are sufficient |
| | | to meet all stated project goals and support the required shifts in instruction and focus standards at |
| | | each grade level. |
| | | |

| Grant project area affected | Specific project | Description of change |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| C. Data | 24/56: Develop and | Shift \$1,948,320 in Year 2 equipment and contractual funds to Year 3 due to the change in budget year |
| Systems to | Implement a Course | and changes to the project scope. As described below, procurement originally planned for the system |
| Support | Registration System | described in project 24/56 will now be fulfilled through the Learning Management System (LMS), |
| Instruction | | procured with 26/43 project funds. Project funds in 24/56 will be used for the procurement of 1) |
| | | infrastructural support services for ongoing work, 2) hiring of professional development services to |
| | | enable end-user training and training module development, and 3) procurement of portal design |
| | | services to develop the main Race to the Top consolidated portal for all Race to the Top web-enabled applications. |
| C. Data | 26/43: Implement a | 1) Shift \$2,112,465 from Year 2 equipment and contractual costs to Years 3 and 4 equipment, Year 3 |
| Systems to | System to Support | contractual, and Year 3 indirect costs due to change in budget year and project delays. As a result of |
| Support | LMS for | procurement delays the LMS will not roll out until spring 2013, instead of fall 2012. Shifting funds will |
| Instruction | Intervention, | allow for vendor payments to be spread across three years ensuring that risks associated with one-time |
| | Enhancement, and | payment are alleviated. 2) The State will also shift all project activities related to procurement for the |
| | Enrichment | Course Registration System (project 24/56) to this project, as the LMS (will meet the needs of the systems described in projects 26/43 and 24/56. |
| D. Great | 28/47: Develop and | Due to change in budget year, the State will shift \$651,006 from Year 2 to Year 3. Of this total, \$265,609 |
| Teachers and | Implement a | was encumbered in contracts, but not expended during Year 2. |
| Leaders | Statistical Model to | |
| | Measure Student | |
| | Growth | |

| Grant project area affected | Specific project | Description of change |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|
| D. Great | 30/49: Expand | 1) Shift a total of \$879,548 in Year 2 contractual and equipment funds to Year 3 contractual, equipment, |
| Teachers and | Educator | and indirect costs due to delays in ratifying an Memorandum of Understanding with a partner agency |
| Leaders | Information System | and delayed procurement. Development, testing, and implementation of the upgraded Educator |
| | to Accommodate | Information System will continue into Year 3 instead of being completed in Year 2, as initially planned. |
| | Additional Data | 2) The State made minor adjustments to its indirect costs based on the revised rate and actual direct |
| | | costs. |
| D. Great | 33/50: | Due to the change in budget year, the State will shift \$1,072,000 from Year 2 to Year 3. All of these |
| Teachers and | Compensation to | funds were obligated in contracts, but not expended, during Year 2. |
| Leaders | Teachers and | |
| | Principals in the | |
| | Lowest 5% Schools | |
| D. Great | 36/75: Maryland | Due to the change in budget year, the State will shift \$638,445 from Year 2 to Year 3. However, 100% of |
| Teachers and | Approved Programs | these funds were obligated, but not expended, during Year 2. |
| Leaders | (MAP) Cost for | |
| | LEAs, Providers, | |
| | and IHEs (UTeach) | |
| D. Great | 41/24: Educator | Due to the change in budget year, the State will shift \$3,103,666 from Year 2 to Year 3. However, |
| Teachers and | Instructional | \$2,628,077 was obligated, but not expended, during Year 2. |
| Leaders | Improvement | |
| | Academies | |
| | | |

| Grant project area affected | Specific project | Description of change | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| D. Great | 43/21: Develop On- | The State will shift \$700,000 back to Years 3 and 4 that was previously approved by amendment to | |
| Teachers and | Line Professional | move to Year 2. No funds were expended in Year 2, although the State reports extensive work in the | |
| Leaders | Development on | project and remains on track with the goals outlined in its approved Scope of Work. However, the | |
| | Educator | State experienced procurement delays during Year 2. | |
| | Instructional | | |
| | Improvement | | |
| | Content | | |
| E. Turning | 46/57: School | 1) Hire one additional Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) specialist and two PBIS | |
| Around the | Culture and Climate | coaches/trainers to provide differentiated supports directly to the schools that are receiving services | |
| Lowest- | | under this project. Maryland has determined that the identified schools are implementing the system | |
| Achieving | | with varying degrees of fidelity and would like to focus its efforts in Years 3 and 4 on providing | |
| Schools | | individualized support to each school. 2) Due to project delays, the State has identified \$519,176.00 in | |
| | | additional funds. The State will submit an amendment to propose a use for these funds. | |
| Invitational | 54/79: Implement | 1) Shift \$332,176 in Year 2 contractual, travel, equipment, and supplies costs to Year 3 contractual | |
| Priority | Statewide | because additional time is needed to complete the implementation phase of the eTranscript system and | |
| - | Centralized Student | to monitor and support system modifications and connectivity. 2) The State made minor adjustments | |
| | Transcript System | to its indirect costs based on the revised rate and actual direct costs. | |

The projects in the following table had minor shifts in indirect costs based on the revised rate and actual direct costs.

| Grant Area | Project |
|------------------------------|--|
| B. Standards and Assessments | 5/4: Curriculum and Formative Assessment Development for ITEEA |
| B. Standards and Assessments | 7/5: World Languages Pipeline |

| Grant Area | Project |
|--|--|
| C. Data Systems to Support Instruction | 9/27: Accessing and Using Sate Data Dashboards |
| C. Data Systems to Support Instruction | 12/60: Expansion to LDS for Data Exchange |
| C. Data Systems to Support Instruction | 23/55: Develop Framework for Teacher Toolkit Portal |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 25/10: MSDE -IHE Teacher Preparation Workgoup |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 27/46: Equating MSA for Use on Growth Model |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 31/30: Building Leadership Capacity in Low-Achieving Urban |
| | and Rural Districts |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 32/73: Teach for Maryland |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 35/26: Elementary STEM Certification |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 39/25: Teacher Induction Academies |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 40/15: Professional Development for Executive Officers |
| D. Great Teachers and Leaders | 42/17: Expand Maryland Principals' Academy to Target Low- |
| | Achieving Schools |
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 44/41: The Breakthrough Center |
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 45/67: RITA Team Audits in 20 Tier I and Tier II Schools |
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 47/45: Coordinated Student Services |
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 48/69: School Health Services |

| Grant Area | Project |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 49/63: Physical Activity |
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 50/58: Extended Learning |
| E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools | 52/77: Primary Talent Development |